United Nations S/PV.6805

Security Council

Sixty-seventh year

Provisional

6805th meeting
Thursday, 12 July 2012, 10 a.m.
New York

President:	Ms. Holguín Cuéllar	(Colombia)
Members:	Azerbaijan	Mr. Mehdiyev
	China	Mr. Li Baodong
	France	Mr. Araud
	Germany	Mr. Wittig
	Guatemala	Mr. Rosenthal
	India	Mr. Vinay Kumar
	Morocco	Mr. Loulichki
	Pakistan	Mr. Haroon
	Portugal	Mr. Moraes Cabral
	Russian Federation	Mr. Pankin
	South Africa	Mr. Mashabane
	Togo	Mr. Menan
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Mark Lyall Grant
	United States of America	Ms. Rice

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fifth session (S/2012/70)

Note verbale dated 2 July 2012 from the Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2012/511)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

12-41659 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fifth session (S/2012/70)

Note verbale dated 2 July 2012 from the Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2012/511)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Under rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representatives of Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Egypt, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, the Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland and Tunisia to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Eugène-Richard Gasana, former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Rwanda, to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Abulkalam Abdul Momen, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Mr. Joachim von Amsberg, Vice-President and Head of Network Operations, Policy and Country Services of the World Bank, to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Thomas Mayr-Harting, Head of the Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2012/70, which contains the report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fifth session. I also wish to draw the attention of members to document S/2012/511, which contains a note verbale dated 2 July 2012 from the Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

I welcome the presence of the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, and invite him to take the floor.

The Secretary-General: I commend Colombia's initiative to convene this timely debate, and I thank the Foreign Minister of Colombia for taking the time to preside over this meeting.

The international community has long recognized the challenging and multidimensional character of the transition from conflict to sustainable peace and development. Security Council mandates have grown in scope. Our field missions now perform an unprecedented variety of tasks. We have increasingly integrated the various efforts carried out under the United Nations flag, and we have come to understand that we can succeed only if we work in close partnership with other key international actors, in support of nationally owned priorities.

The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) and the Peacebuilding Support Office were established in 2005 to reinforce ongoing efforts on the ground in conflict-affected countries. Yet questions remain as to the focus and effectiveness of these bodies. Two years after the mixed review of the peacebuilding architecture, we are seeing signs that it has begun to come of age and is making a difference. This is the case particularly in those instances when the Peacebuilding Commission, Fund and Support Office reinforce each other and work hand in hand with the United Nations presence on the ground.

In Liberia, for example, the Peacebuilding Commission and Fund have worked closely with United Nations actors on the ground to strengthen existing field efforts in the area of security sector and justice reform. This collective engagement is helping to establish the first of five regional justice and security hubs, which are critical elements of our transition strategy for the United Nations Mission and Liberia.

In Sierra Leone, the PBC and PBF have been supporting efforts to deepen democracy. Over the course of five years, this work has evolved from strengthening State institutions, through the establishment of anti-corruption and human rights commissions, to empowering non-State actors.

In Guinea, after more than 50 years of dominance by the military, the country has moved towards democratic rule and we are supporting the crucially important step of conducting a military census and providing a retirement programme for 4,000 military personnel.

But of course, much remains to be done. Let me highlight three areas in which we can enhance the impact of our peacebuilding tools.

First, the PBC should do more to leverage its unique membership and collective ability to mobilize resources. Through distinct messages that complement those of others, the Commission can reinforce the efforts of national actors, Member States, and the United Nations family at Headquarters and on the ground.

Secondly, the PBC should sustain the focus on longer-term peacebuilding. The Commission's contribution can be particularly valuable in galvanizing international commitment beyond the limited lifespans of United Nations missions on the ground.

Thirdly, the PBC may be able to add significant value in some non-mission settings, where national authorities and Resident Coordinators would benefit from the intergovernmental support that the Commission can bring to bear. In order for the PBC to fully meet its potential, the Security Council should offer greater clarity on what type of advice it would like from the Commission in its deliberations and in the definition of mandates. That would help lead United Nations departments and actors in the field to coordinate with the Commission, and reduce the risk of duplication.

The United Nations is committed to maximizing the potential of the Peacebuilding Commission and the wider peacebuilding architecture. Assisted by the Support Office and in synergy with operational lead entities, the Commission's impact in the field can be further amplified. The United Nations is also working to enhance our cooperation with the international financial institutions, including the World Bank and the African Development Bank. We are also committed to supporting the new model of partnership between fragile and conflict-affected countries and their development partners, as envisaged last year by the g7+ countries and their partners in the New Deal on Engagement in Fragile States.

But we need the support of Member States, including for the Peacebuilding Fund. The PBF has proven itself as a timely and flexible financing instrument when peacebuilding needs are most acute and when few other resources are available for early post-conflict interventions.

As I outlined in my action agenda for my second term, supporting nations in transition is a top priority and generational opportunity for the United Nations. We have much work ahead of us. But if the United Nations family, Member States and the wider multilateral system work together in support of nationally owned strategies, we can have an impact far greater than any single entity could achieve on its own. That is what we owe the peoples we serve. We look forward to deepening that work together.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Secretary-General for his statement.

I now give the floor to Mr. Gasana.

Mr. Gasana: I am pleased to present the report (S/2012/70) of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) on its fifth session.

We have come a long way in appreciating the imperative of complementing the investment in peacemaking and peacekeeping with a long-term vision for sustainable peace. Today, we know that peacebuilding is more than a set of activities and tasks to be mandated, undertaken and reviewed. Peacebuilding is, rather, a state of mind — a culture of policymaking, planning, funding and implementing activities in post-conflict settings. Today, we know that peacebuilding is a term used to describe the continuum that spans all efforts to lay the foundations for sustainable development and for resilient societies and institutions. Today, we have a platform that could help the United Nations and the international community to conceive such a long-term vision for peace and to sustain attention on critical priorities. Today, we have the PBC, whose full potential we have yet to tap.

During the reporting period under review today, the PBC responded to the request for advice and support from the Republic of Guinea, thereby becoming the sixth country to be placed on the PBC's agenda. The decision taken by the Commission to respond positively

to Guinea's request for advice marked a new phase in the evolution of the PBC. This is a country that has not emerged from an armed conflict, is not on the agenda of the Council and has no mandated mission deployed to it. In Guinea, the PBC is up for a new challenge to support the country in a crucial political and socio-economic transition phase.

In the other five countries on the Commission's agenda — Burundi, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia and Sierra Leone — the PBC has continued to support each country through the different stages and challenges facing the peacebuilding processes.

The reporting period also included the Commission's initial effort to respond to the resolution 1947 (2010), concerning the outcome of the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. At the beginning of the year, the Commission adopted a road map of actions as an implementation framework to take forward relevant recommendations emanating from the review, with special emphasis on enhancing the Commission's impact in the field.

Allow me to highlight just three elements from the annual report before us today.

First, the report underscores the activities undertaken by the Commission's various configurations to reach out to and engage a number of critical actors within and outside the United Nations. In view of the complexity of peacebuilding challenges and the multiplicity of actors, the need for coherence and partnerships cannot be overemphasized. Building and strengthening partnerships with relevant actors has been identified as a key area of potential added value for the Commission. In that regard, the PBC devoted the majority of its effort and time to engaging with the international financial institutions, especially the World Bank and the African Development Bank. In the particular case of the African Development Bank, the reporting period laid the foundation for a deep and diverse partnership that promises to align the Commission's and the Bank's engagement in the countries on the agenda.

Secondly, the Commission has an enormous capacity to promote knowledge and experience-sharing. To that end, the Government of Rwanda, together with the PBC and in collaboration with the African Development Bank, hosted a high-level meeting on the theme "Post-conflict peacebuilding: the experience of Rwanda", held in Kigali on 8 and 9 November 2011. The event represented an innovative effort by the Commission to serve as a platform for promoting experience-sharing between the six countries on its agenda and other countries that have undergone peacebuilding and State-building processes. There is a real need to nurture that type of cooperation among the countries of the South. The PBC is best suited to become a platform for such cooperation.

Thirdly, the Commission has continued to prioritize the need for strengthening the interaction with, and its advisory role vis-à-vis, the principal organs of the United Nations. Briefings by the Chairs of the country-specific configurations to the Security Council have become systematic ahead of the Council's periodic consideration of the situations in, and mandate involving, the countries on the Commission's agenda. The year 2011 also witnessed the introduction by the Council of the informal interactive dialogues on certain country situations.

The 2010 review particularly highlighted the potential for developing a dynamic linkage between the Commission and the Council. Fourteen out of the 15 members of the Security Council are currently members of the PBC in its various configurations. The joint membership offers a natural interface that would facilitate the Council's drawing more proactively and regularly on the Commission's advice. I would like to echo the Secretary-General's point on the need for clarity from the Council regarding the specific areas for which the PBC's advice could be sought.

The reporting period also witnessed the continuing development of the Commission's relationship with the Economic and Social Council. The jointly organized special event on the Millennium Development Goals in countries emerging from conflict testified to the Commission's growing advocacy role for an integrated approach to peacebuilding, including through a well-deserved focus on the socio-economic dimension of peacebuilding.

There is need to empower the PBC to become the central United Nations platform for support to countries emerging from conflict and aspiring to sustained engagement as they undertake the arduous task of building national capacity and institutions. The challenge facing the Commission in demonstrating its full potential, however, is to ensure that its work in support of these countries is backed by a high degree of political commitment from the Member States and

the senior United Nations leadership. This is our shared responsibility and one that we are yet to shoulder with full commitment.

As noted by the co-facilitators of the 2010 review report, "the review should become a wake-up call to strengthen the collective resolve to deal with peacebuilding in a more comprehensive and determined way" (S/2011/41, para. 107). I hope that today's debate will take us a step further towards realizing the full potential of the Commission.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Gasana for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Momen.

Mr. Momen: In just over six years, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), with valuable support from the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), has helped to generate a much-needed focus on the complex challenges of post-conflict peacebuilding. As the Secretary-General rightly noted, while its full potential is yet to be realized, the architecture has started to demonstrate signs of what it is capable of doing. The 2010 review indeed contributed to renewing our commitment to strengthening the architecture and ensuring that it can meet its full potential.

At the outset, I wish to recognize the constructive role played by the Chairs of the respective PBC configurations. Drawing on their experience of working with the countries on the agenda and in the field, their inputs to this statement have been invaluable.

As indicated in the PBC's annual report (S/2012/70) and in the concept paper prepared by the presidency for this debate (S/2012/511, annex), there is need for better understanding of the nature and scope of the Commission's role. Faced with diverse expectations and challenges, the PBC will certainly benefit from a common articulation of its real potential and limitations. This debate represents an opportunity that should be fully utilized. I shall therefore begin on a very frank note.

As an intergovernmental body that is dedicated to addressing the special needs of countries emerging from conflict, the PBC was conceived around the imperative of ensuring the commitment of a broad range of the most relevant global actors. These actors include its own members, which are drawn from the membership of the three principal organs and from the top financial and troop and police contributors to the United Nations. They also include institutional donors and regional actors. This unique membership structure suggests that the PBC could leverage the collective political, financial and technical capacities of its member States and institutional partners in support of national peacebuilding objectives in the countries on its agenda.

In contrast to these expectations, the Commission's engagement has been too frequently defined by the individual efforts made by the leadership of the country configurations and, in rare instances, by a few interested members. The full potential of such a unique political platform, made up of the most influential global actors, has unfortunately not been met. This is a statement that invites serious reflection.

At the same time and despite those difficulties, the PBC has still managed to show signs of its vast potential in the area of political accompaniment and advocacy. To name but a few examples, it has been able to confer legitimacy upon serious national and United Nations efforts to build trust between political actors in the case of Sierra Leone in 2009; manage tensions accompanying electoral processes in Burundi in 2010; support national capacity development for police and the rule of law in Liberia since 2011; support security sector reform in Guinea, leading notably to the completion of the largest military retirement project in the country's history in late 2011; and provide effective support to the first round of presidential elections in Guinea-Bissau last March.

The partnership with the international financial institutions is also an area in which the PBC has demonstrated signs of potential. The most recent completion of the new poverty reduction strategies in Burundi and the Central African Republic offered an opportunity to strengthen the United Nations partnership with the World Bank and the African Development Bank and to integrate peacebuilding priorities into socio-economic planning and programming for both countries. In the case of Guinea-Bissau, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have supported a significant debt relief, helping to generate a virtuous economic cycle in the country. In the case of Guinea, the World Bank is partnering with the Government and other peacebuilding stakeholders to launch a productive social safety nets project that will provide employment to 24,000 young people and women.

Last year's Kigali high-level meeting demonstrated the PBC's potential to facilitate South-South and triangular cooperation in critical and recurring peacebuilding priorities, such as aid and donor coordination, national reconciliation, reintegration, job creation, and security sector and justice reform.

It is difficult to imagine how the international community and the United Nations will be able to tap into this potential in the absence of the political commitment of individual Governments, and the United Nations system as a whole, to render the PBC's efforts successful. The United Nations and other partners should view the PBC as an opportunity and a source of support, not as a competitor or an additional layer of bureaucracy.

At the same time, the PBC must also make great effort to enhance its stature and added value. We must continue to refine and adapt the Commission's instruments and forms of engagement to changing needs and circumstances at the country level; strengthen linkages with the United Nations leadership and other key actors in the field and at Headquarters; explore practical approaches to facilitating resource mobilization; and develop ways of assessing peacebuilding progress. In accomplishing these objectives, the PBC needs the continued and increased support of the PBSO and other relevant United Nations and non-United Nations actors engaged in peacebuilding.

It is significant that this debate on the potential and limits of the PBC is taking place under the auspices of the Security Council, as one of the two parent institutions of the Commission, along with the General Assembly. Given the fact that the Security Council is facing an ever-increasing number of situations to cope with, the PBC can play a useful role in alleviating the Council's workload by looking after situations that are not on its immediate agenda. We thus look forward to innovative ideas and suggestions from Council members. In the meantime, allow me to share a few preliminary ideas suggested by the Chairs group that could provide a framework for strengthening and taking forward these relations.

First, the relations between the Security Council and country-specific configurations should be further intensified and institutionalized. Such a relationship could manifest itself most importantly when the Council is in the process of establishing or renewing the mandate for a country under PBC consideration. Council resolutions could also include specific requests for advice from the PBC around the priority areas identified with the country concerned. This would help the Council to receive more focused analysis on issues ranging from the linkages between security and socio-economic development, the alignment of key actors behind national priorities, the opportunities for connection with relevant global initiatives, and the status of partnerships between the United Nations and other relevant actors in the country concerned.

Secondly, I share the Secretary-General's belief that the PBC would benefit from clarity on the division of roles and responsibilities with the senior United Nations leadership in the field. Such clarity would facilitate the establishment of mutually reinforcing relations in a manner that would optimize the implementation of Council mandates and allow for developing coherent messages and engagement with national actors. We must assure the senior United Nations leadership in the field that the PBC is committed to supporting their role on the ground and that their cooperation is essential to the work of the Commission.

Thirdly, the advice of the PBC could be most relevant as the Council considers a transition from one form of United Nations engagement to another. This advice is expected to be based on an assessment of progress in national peacebuilding efforts, of the level of support from and commitment of the international community, and of the specific capacities required for the United Nations country team to continue to support long-term peacebuilding efforts in the country concerned.

Fourthly and finally, there is need for periodic information sharing with the Council on country-specific opportunities and risks. This would help the Council to identify areas for which greater buy-in and coherence from the United Nations system and the international community should be sought and attained in a timely manner. The Chairs of the PBC country configurations highly value the opportunity given to them to formally brief the Council on the situation in the countries concerned.

We also commend the initiative taken by certain Council Presidents in organizing interactive informal dialogues on country-specific issues. As an incremental step, for instance, a more systematic and periodic use of the country-specific informal format, possibly on a quarterly basis, needs to be considered. Such regular and substantive exchanges could be of great value to the

Security Council ahead of the Council's field visits to countries on the PBC agenda. They could also focus on thematic and regional issues concerning more than one country-specific configuration, for example emerging threats such as transnational organized crime.

In addition, an annual interactive dialogue on the occasion of the consideration of the PBC's annual report could also address broader systemic issues of mutual interest. We look forward to discussing these and other suggestions in the full membership of the Peacebuilding Commission and in the context of the planned informal dialogue.

It is essential that the countries on the agenda of the PBC not relapse into conflict. Therefore, we must continue to maintain our focus on enhancing the PBC's impact in the field. This impact should be ideally manifested by empowering national actors to own and lead the peacebuilding process and by ensuring that the United Nations and other key actors are positioned to support this endeavour. The PBC will strive to provide hope and facilitate the efforts of the national leadership to achieve sustainable peace and security.

Our goal is also to offer all relevant national actors a fair chance at building resilient societies and institutions. This is undoubtedly a goal shared by the Security Council and the broader membership of the United Nations. This is a goal that can be attained only if we manage to muster the necessary political will and commitment.

In conclusion, I invite us all to take this debate as an opportunity to recommit ourselves to putting the needs and aspirations of the peoples of the countries affected by or emerging from conflict ahead of everything else. I recall that none of the post-conflict, low-income, fragile countries can yet achieve a single Millennium Development Goal, but there is hope that countries that could manage to reduce violence also could produce some of the fastest development gains. Therefore, our commitments must be rock solid and long-term, and we must persevere. With the Council's concerted effort, we will win.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Momen for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Von Amsberg.

Mr. Von Amsberg: I thank the Secretary-General and Ambassadors Momen and Gasana for their leadership in this very important endeavour. I thank you, Madam President, for inviting the World Bank to brief the Council on the progress on the strengthening and deepening partnership with the United Nations to support peacebuilding and development in fragile country situations.

I bring with me today the good wishes from the World Bank President, Mr. Jim Yong Kim, who assumed the presidency just last week. He is very much looking forward to engaging over the next weeks and months closely with all our partners on how to deepen and strengthen our collaboration and, in particular, on how to make our work on the ground in conflict and fragile situations even more effective in the future.

Over the past 20 years, we have seen formidable progress in global poverty reduction, but progress has been uneven. Issues of conflict, fragility and violence are among the biggest obstacles to development. Fragile and conflict-affected States are the furthest from achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

I just want to make a few comments on how the World Bank is scaling up its own efforts to fight poverty and promote development in these particular situations, talk about our rising partnerships, and make a few comments on future developments.

On our own efforts over the past two years, when we prepared the *World Development Report 2011* on conflict, security and development, in very close collaboration with the United Nations, we decided to scale up and intensify our work in conflict and fragile situations. We are now putting into operation that document, which has set us on a new path. We have seen that the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States, formed in Busan at the High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in November and December 2011, and which was endorsed by about 40, countries embodies some of the same principles of more effective partnerships in support of those partner countries. The New Deal and the *World Development Report 2011* call for the international community to re-examine the way it engages in situations of fragility and conflict.

Challenges facing fragile and conflict-affected countries cannot be resolved on a short-term basis or with partial solutions in the absence of institutions that provide people with security, justice and jobs. The development assistance must support and must go hand-in-hand with peace and State-building goals. We at the World Bank are making four major changes on

how we engage in our work in situations of fragility and conflict.

First, we are doing strategies differently. Our country strategies for fragile and conflict-affected States are now focused on support to peace and State-building goals, directly or indirectly through the programmes we are supporting.

Secondly, we are financing differently. Together with our partners in the International Development Association — the World Bank's fund for the poorest countries — we are developing proposals to simplify, adjust and accelerate the framework for allocating resources to fragile and conflict-affected situations. We also have a State- and Peace-building Fund, which we use as a pilot fund to actually implement the ideas of the *World Development Report 2011* and the New Deal for International Engagement in Fragile States. In fact, aligning financial instruments is critical for all of us in order to ensure coherence in our approaches to working with fragile and conflict-affected situations. We have therefore launched a discussion on how to align the World Bank's State- and Peace-Building Fund with the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund and on how we can learn from each other.

Thirdly, we are operating differently. We are also developing a package of internal reforms to enable more informed risk-taking, more nimble operational responses to changing environments, more hands-on implementation support to partner teams, and new approaches for measuring results.

Fourthly, we are deploying our human resources differently. The g7+ group of fragile and conflict-affected States has challenged us by saying that they need more face-time with more senior technology specialists on the ground, working more closely with partners in the United Nations and other agencies. In response, we have created a new centre in Nairobi, the Global Centre on Conflict, Security and Development, and are increasing our staff presence in several conflict-affected countries.

I would like now to turn to the partnership and our work with the Peacebuilding Commission. The New Deal and the g7+ have called for strong national ownership of development and peacebuilding strategies and for the alignment of development partners to support those strategies. To achieve those objectives, we need to see greater coherence across an international aid structure that is often too divided and too stove-piped between development, security and humanitarian and diplomatic assistance. That is where the Peacebuilding Commission can play a fundamental role in bridging some of those gaps, as it has in the past. The regular exchanges that are being promoted between the United Nations, its Member States and the World Bank Board have also been instrumental in bringing about that coherence.

The World Bank has supported the Peacebuilding Commission's work since it was founded, six years ago. It has engaged actively in all of the Commission's country-specific configurations. We have been coordinating our respective efforts well.

The Commission has provided useful inputs and guidance to our country teams. I am also encouraged to see that the Commission's country-specific configurations are working to enhance coordination and coherence on the ground. The suggestions made by Ambassador Momen also offer promising avenues for further enhancing the Commission's impact.

Over the past two to three years, the United Nations-World Bank partnership has continued to grow at both the institutional and the country levels. Our teams are collaborating more than ever to ensure that our strategies are aligned and that we respond in a complementary fashion. We see progress in all of the country-specific configuration areas and in all six countries on the agenda. Ambassador Momen has already mentioned some of the joint initiatives.

In the Central African Republic, we are working with the former Belgian Chair on a common agenda to support the Government and development partners.

In Liberia, we are coordinating our upcoming country assistance strategy with the country-led implementation of the New Deal and the Peacebuilding Commission's efforts led by the Swedish Chair.

In Burundi, we are working hand-in-hand with the Swiss Chair and are jointly supporting the Government in organizing a partners' meeting this fall.

In Sierra Leone, the leadership of the Canadian Chair helped all partners align behind the Agenda for Change, and we are coordinating efforts in the critical area of job creation.

In Guinea-Bissau, the World Bank and the Brazilian Chair joined forces to support the country in reaching the decision point under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative.

In Guinea, as the Ambassador mentioned, we collaborate closely with the Government and the Ambassador of Luxembourg on a number of critical issues, including employment generation, and we are exploring ways to further engage in the area of security sector reform.

The World Bank and the United Nations, along with the European Union, are also strengthening coordination on the framework for post-crisis assessments, as the recent example of the joint assessment in Yemen effectively illustrates.

In addition to the country-level collaboration I mentioned, we have thematic collaboration in a joint platform for coordinating job creation and collaboration in the area of justice and security.

We are also working to more effectively address on-the-ground implementation. The World Bank and the United Nations are finalizing a review of the important Fiduciary Principles Accord, which facilitates implementation by one entity of trust funds managed by the other, in specific post-crisis circumstances. That review will open space for a broader discussion of how the World Bank and the United Nations can collaborate to address operational challenges to implementation on the ground, including increased interoperability, common approaches to risk management and the development of instruments for combined operations.

We are also carrying out a joint review of the United Nations-World Bank collaboration within the 2008 Partnership Framework Agreement to take stock of cooperation and identify priorities going forward.

That brings me to my final point, on future perspectives. We need to continue to strengthen our partnership and alignment of activities in the countries on the Peacebuilding Commission's agenda, especially our work on needs assessments and poverty reduction strategies.

We support the recommendations of the annual report to further explore complementary programming between the United Nations, the World Bank and other international actors, where issues of security, justice and development intersect.

It will be most useful to link the relevant recommendations of the *World Development Report 2011*, the review of civilian capacity and the ongoing work of the Peacebuilding Commission. Additionally, the implementation of the New Deal offers fresh opportunities to strengthen our collaboration. Six States that have endorsed the New Deal are also on the agenda of the Commission. The Commission has a role in ensuring the coherence and alignment of international assistance behind the New Deal's implementation.

Better support to peacebuilding requires moving from needs-based approaches towards genuine prioritization. The peace- and State-building goals provide a great starting point for such prioritization by highlighting the issues that States themselves have identified as critical moving forward. The Peacebuilding Commission could be a useful forum in which to explore how the peace- and State-building goals and specific challenges facing conflict-affected countries can be reflected in the post-2015 United Nations Development Assistance Framework.

Delivering results for people living in fragile and conflict-affected situations will require concerted and sustained efforts from all of us. The World Bank is deeply committed to that agenda and looks forward to working closely with all partners around the table.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to thank Mr. Von Amsberg for his briefing and for all the commitment shown by the World Bank.

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia.

I would like to thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for joining us and for his presentation. Likewise, I would like to highlight the statements made by the former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Rwanda, Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana, by the current Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, Ambassador Abulkalam Abdul Momen, and by Mr. Joachim von Amsberg, Vice-President for Operations Policy and Country Services of the World Bank.

The 2005 World Summit reached a milestone when we took on a commitment to give impetus to peacebuilding in post-conflict situations. Within the Organization, the Commission has been given the role of proposing and advising on strategies for post-conflict recovery and of bringing together all the agents involved in resource mobilization. Colombia considers peacebuilding processes to be of vital importance. Peacebuilding constitutes a fundamental stage if countries are to overcome the root causes of a

conflict. We hope that this discussion will contribute to strengthening the Commission towards that end.

We know from experience that there is no substitute for strengthening national institutions and that sustainable results are those supported by national ownership. The generation of local and national capacity and ownership over processes, strategies and policies are indispensable conditions for avoiding a relapse into conflict.

A successful peacebuilding process is the first step towards leaving behind past conflict and confrontation and laying a solid and lasting foundation for a promising future for the population. The main responsibility for successful peacebuilding belongs to Governments and relevant national agents, including civil society.

From the Commission's report (S/2012/70), it is clear that the challenges presented by peacebuilding in post-conflict situations demand an ongoing learning process, bearing in mind that no situations are identical and no formulas can be universally applied. Six years after the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission, the fundamental notion of its mandate is still novel for an international community used to thinking almost exclusively in terms of conflicts and their resolution. For the Security Council, it is also novel to move from a paradigm centred on maintaining international peace and security, in application of Chapter VII of the Charter, towards a vision focused on strengthening national capacity and promoting conditions for sustainable development.

Experience has shown the United Nations that peacekeeping tasks cannot be thought of as separate from post-conflict approaches. The structural strengthening of institutions and of the architecture that allows States to function encompasses both peacekeeping and peacebuilding. The actions of peacekeepers clearly can set solid foundations for early peacebuilding.

Of foremost importance is strengthening national capacities and creating the conditions for countries to regain their full independence and sovereignty, generate development and promote the welfare of their populations. Regional and subregional organizations, more closely acquainted with the challenges faced by a country going through the rebuilding process, play an important role in that process through their vision and leadership. In that regard, it is important to highlight the role of international financial institutions, such as the World Bank, and of regional banks similarly working for recovery and reconciliation and building the social, economic and financial structures of countries in such transition.

The Commission has the potential to create mechanisms and modalities to identify knowledge and lessons learned in matters of technical assistance, and thus to promote South-South cooperation. Likewise, it can help States on its agenda to strengthen their national capacities by coordinating the activities of donors and encouraging transparency and accountability.

We commend the configurations for each country on the Commission's agenda for applying flexible and realistic criteria. Such criteria allow for work on the ground within available capacities and provide existing institutions the time and opportunity to achieve their own results. The Commission and its configurations require the commitment and active participation of all their members. It is important to establish specific objectives through which genuine progress and political support can be achieved.

In that context, visits by the Chairs of the configurations are valuable tools, not only in lending political support to countries on the agenda but also as a channel for dialogue between the various national actors and the United Nations system. We therefore believe that dialogue between the General Assembly and the Peacebuilding Commission must be maintained and deepened. We take note of the channel of communication established through the report of the Chairperson of the Commission to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations. In that spirit, Colombia will hold an interactive dialogue with the Security Council, the Commission and the countries on its agenda in order to provide an opportunity to exchange opinions in a frank and dynamic manner, jointly analyse expectations and achievements, and establish realistic objectives.

Deepening peacebuilding means modifying traditional attitudes and adjusting to countries and regions that are ever more autonomous in the international system. That shift in balances of power calls for dialogue and political solutions to issues that have traditionally been addressed through sanctions or confrontation. Nations like ours that understand the difficulty of achieving lasting peace know that, despite the obstacles and challenges, we must believe in the possibility of peace and development for

nations affected by conflicts. We know that the path of peacebuilding road is not an easy one.

Given its experience and the challenges it has overcome, and aware that there are still more to surmount, Colombia believes that we must focus on bringing people hope and offering them a chance for a decent life, moving beyond the circumstances of the past. That can be done through public policies providing, inter alia, for reparation for victims and creating effective mechanisms to promote social and economic development to the benefit of the most vulnerable and affected population. We believe that lasting peace can be achieved through a balance of policies that provide for reparations and that generate sustainable welfare and prosperity in the long term. We must commit ourselves to finding policies that promote consensus, heal the wounds of the past and allow societies — especially younger generations — to rebuild their countries, create opportunities and work towards reconciliation, security and peace.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

I shall now give the floor to the members of the Security Council.

Ms. Rice (United States of America): I thank you, Minister Holguín Cuéllar, for chairing this important debate. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General, Ambassador Gasana, Ambassador Momen and Mr. Von Amsberg for their important leadership on the issue of peacebuilding.

We have learned time and again that the end of conflict does not mean that peace has necessarily arrived. Sustained peace must be built on a durable foundation of national commitment, broad international support and experience informed by the lessons of the past. The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has an important role to play, and can continue to enhance its contribution by focusing its efforts, strengthening coordination with internal and external stakeholders, and highlighting best practices.

First, peacebuilding cannot succeed without national ownership. That is indispensable. Government, civil society and citizens must be engaged regularly in order to ensure the international community responds to their needs. We encourage the PBC to engage affected communities in shaping peacebuilding priorities and to incorporate the perspectives of youth and women in particular, which are crucial to post-conflict recovery.

The Liberia configuration's recent meeting with a local peace committee is one example of grass-roots engagement that should be repeated. Peacebuilding strategies need to be integral to national plans, not an added burden to post-conflict Governments already struggling to manage delicate transitions. The PBC can help reinforce existing national strategies and ensure a focused effort from all actors. The PBC has done that effectively in Sierra Leone by adopting the Government's Agenda for Change as the basis for its engagement in the country. As a result, the PBC promotes a single vision for Sierra Leone's future.

Secondly, the international community still struggles with coordinating an increasingly crowded field of peacebuilding actors. We urge the PBC to forge and expand partnerships with international financial institutions, including the African Development Bank and the World Bank, major donors and key regional actors. Deeper relationships between the PBC and regional organizations, such as the Economic Community of West African States, would also benefit many countries on the PBC agenda, particularly in dealing with issues that benefit from regional solutions, including combating transnational illicit networks.

Thirdly, mobilizing resources for peacebuilding remains an enormous challenge, but one on which the PBC can have a significant impact. We commend the country-specific configuration Chairs for publicly advocating for sustained commitment to peacebuilding and increasing the alignment of PBC priorities with projects supported by the Peacebuilding Fund. The PBC can also leverage its diverse composition and convening power to mobilize new sources of investment and support, including from the private sector, and work to ensure timely and successful donor conferences and related processes.

Fourthly, today's discussion of the PBC's effectiveness cannot be separated from the broader work of United Nations peacebuilding, including efforts to develop and deploy more effectively capable civilian specialists in the aftermath of conflict.

We welcome the commitment of the Secretary-General to implement reforms since the issuance of his report (S/2011/527) on the subject. Those include the development of an online mechanism to access the marketplace of civilian expertise, and

the designation of a new global focal point on the rule of law, to bring greater coherence to the work of the United Nations and mobilize the combined expertise of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations on that critical, cross-cutting issue. Indeed, successful peacebuilding requires the United Nations to pool its own system-wide expertise.

On other multifaceted issues, such as youth employment and improving public sector capacity-building, progress still needs to be made in bringing all partners together around common strategies and effective divisions of labour.

The United Nations can also play a unique role in facilitating triangular partnerships that support the sharing of expertise in post-conflict transitions, such as the initiative of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development to deploy Kenyan, Ugandan and Ethiopian experts to South Sudan, with the support of Norway and UNDP. United Nations agencies can encourage wider use of those and other innovative arrangements when designing peacebuilding activities.

Finally, fortunately, we have an increasingly long list of experiences to inform our support for countries emerging from conflict. The PBC has worked with six countries on a diverse range of peacebuilding needs, and the United Nations has supported numerous other peacebuilding efforts in places such as South Sudan and Timor-Leste.

While there is no one-size-fits-all peacebuilding solution, the United States encourages the PBC, through its Working Group on Lessons Learned, to systematically review peacebuilding precedents and disseminate global best practices from countries on and off the PBC's agenda.

The Council's mandate to advance peace and security demands that we work not just to end conflict, but to prevent its recurrence. By aligning with national priorities, strengthening international partnerships and learning from what we have already accomplished, the Peacebuilding Commission has great potential to help countries emerging from war to stay on the path to peace. The United States looks forward to the Security Council's continuing engagement with the PBC to facilitate and enhance that critical work.

Mr. Menan (Togo) (*spoke in French*): The importance of the debate being held by the Security Council today stems from the fact that peacebuilding remains at the heart of the work of the United Nations. I would therefore like to thank Colombia, Madam President, for deciding to put the issue at the centre of the Council's work for this month.

The annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) on the work of its fifth session (S/2012/70) provides an illustration of the actions taken in 2011. The statements just made by the Secretary-General, the current and outgoing Chairs of the Commission and the representative of the World Bank serve to inform the Council about the work carried out and the challenges to be addressed. I congratulate the Chairs of the PBC and its country-specific configurations for their leadership.

Since the 2005 World Summit, peacebuilding has remained at the centre of United Nations efforts in countries emerging from conflict. Peacebuilding supports peacekeeping in order to enhance the effectiveness and visibility of the United Nations presence, which has the task of considering systematically and comprehensively all of the problems due to or exacerbated by an armed conflict, in order to build a viable State that respects fundamental freedoms and establish good political and economic governance.

Since the establishment of the PBC, the Security Council has also worked to develop and adapt its peacekeeping mandates, which now give pride of place to the rebuilding of a country after peace has been restored.

In that context, my country commends the reconstruction work carried out by the PBC country-specific configurations in Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Guinea, the Central African Republic and Burundi. Although the results vary from one country to another, the new approach translates the will of the United Nations to ensure that countries emerging from conflict do not revert to violence due to a lack of appropriate support.

The Commission's report reviews the key actions of the country-specific configurations, which essentially concern establishing dialogue among the various political actors of a country in order to provide solutions to divisive issues, strengthen national capacities in order to establish a solid foundation for development and mobilize external resources to rebuild the country and foster strengthened coordinated efforts among the various development agencies aimed at consolidating real accomplishments.

It is comforting to note that many sectors of the concerned countries have experienced accelerated development resulting from the initiatives of the country configurations, which have established dialogue among the various actors participating in reconstruction and targeted priority tasks.

Among the priority actions, Togo believes that there should be emphasis on political dialogue among the various actors in a country, so as to ensure that the settlement of political issues will open a path towards democracy while establishing the rule of law and good governance and reforming the key sector of justice.

Nevertheless, Togo would recall that to ensure the long-term success of those actions it is important to continue to prioritize the participation of women and youth in all future initiatives.

The PBC's support for Liberia, Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone and Guinea in West Africa with respect to their development programmes indicates that the issues of youth and women's employment, drug trafficking and security sector reform were particularly targeted because settling those issues is essential to the stability and sustainable development of those countries.

Turning to the issue of transnational organized crime in West Africa, we are pleased by the cooperation among the four country configurations, which have joined efforts to respond to the problem comprehensively based on the principle of common and shared responsibility, along with assistance from exterior actors.

In that regard, the call for cooperation among the PBC, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and INTERPOL deserves support, not only in order to implement the relevant ECOWAS action plan, but also the West Africa Coast Initiative. In each case, it should be noted that awareness-raising, political support and resource-mobilization are key elements of the activities to be conducted.

While congratulating the PBC for its policy on mobilizing resources, we encourage it to strengthen efforts in that area. External financing should assist national authorities to cover all sectors, rather than targeting only a few areas, such as governance, justice sector reform, the preparation of elections and security sector reform.

In that context, my delegation commends the good cooperation established with such international financial institutions as the World Bank, the African Development Bank and other funds and programmes, which all participate in peacebuilding in their own way and according to their own capacities.

In spite of all of those efforts and the encouraging results achieved on the ground, much remains to be done. Other actions and initiatives should be taken to improve the performance of the PBC and the country-specific configurations. Togo believes that the Commission would provide added value in attracting greater appreciation if it were to synchronize cooperation and direct exchanges with local actors and their partners.

By visiting the field more often and meeting not only country authorities but national and international actors and other concerned United Nations bodies, the PBC would be able to see for itself what actions are needed to strengthen its action in the field. Such cooperation would have the added benefit of harmonizing the efforts under way with a view to avoiding duplication. In that respect, the Chair of the PBC should be given the opportunity to join the Security Council on its field missions when needed.

In the same vein, national ownership of development programmes provides another opportunity for the work of the United Nations to succeed in countries where it is involved. This involves, in particular, training for local stakeholders. In order to properly carry out its reconstruction mission, the PBC should also rely on subregional organizations, which have the advantage of knowing the fundamental needs of the people, with particular emphasis on the energy and basic development sectors.

Togo also believes that national reconciliation should be a major focus in efforts to ensure lasting peace. Even if reconciliation is based on the application of justice, the Commission should promote a justice that repairs and restores. In that respect, truth, justice and reconciliation commissions should be supported and encouraged, because they offer true reconciliation after having established the facts, determined who was responsible and provided reparations to the victims.

To conclude, Togo calls once again for greater support from Member States and all competent organizations for the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office.

Mr. Pankin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Allow me to thank Secretary-General Ban

Ki-moon, the Permanent Representatives of Rwanda and Bangladesh and the representative of the World Bank, who have shed light on developments in peacebuilding and on problems and prospects in that area.

Peacebuilding assistance is one of the key factors for the effective settlement of conflicts and the stabilization of post-conflict situations, as well as for avoiding a relapse into crisis. This is especially clear in light of the recent events in the Middle East and the new wave of instability in a number of States on the African continent.

Against this backdrop, today's meeting on the issue of peacebuilding is, in our view, a most timely initiative, and we expect that we will have a candid and comprehensive discussion. We welcome Mrs. María Ángela Holguín Cuéllar, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia.

Within the framework of United Nations peacekeeping missions, peacebuilding offices and the country-specific configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), significant peacebuilding work is being carried out. This activity is difficult and challenging. It requires the coordinated efforts of Member States, United Nations programmes and funds, regional entities, the United Nations Secretariat and international financial institutions.

At the same time, we see that international assistance in this field remains fragmented. There is a need for increased coordination in the division of labour among the relevant stakeholders, and the effectiveness of existing financing mechanisms must be enhanced. Solving those problems will require the close attention of Member States. It will also require the systematization of peacebuilding processes, including by harmonizing the work of the existing United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

The Russian Federation supports the activity of the Peacebuilding Commission. The main added value of this body, in our view, lies in its coordinating role in peacebuilding and in the provision of valuable advice to the Security Council, upon its request, regarding States on its agenda. We would like to convey our gratitude to the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, Mr. Abulkalam Abdul Momen, for his statement and for his first six months of effective leadership of the Commission. We expect that the proposals that he has spelled out, which were drafted jointly with the chairs of the country-specific configurations, will subsequently be carefully considered by the entire Commission.

Regarding the PBC's work as a whole thus far, and despite the time that has passed since 2005, we must note that a great deal remains to be done to optimize the effectiveness of its work. In that respect, we are convinced that the PBC's current mandate and its unique intergovernmental nature and structure are all in keeping with its intended role as a key body in the coordination of peacebuilding assistance.

Serious work is being carried out within the framework of country-specific configurations, and here the PBC's main merit lies in engaging in direct dialogue with Governments, guaranteeing their leading role and ownership of the peacebuilding process as well as determining and setting out the main needs on the ground.

The country-specific configurations are a unique opportunity for cooperation with all peacebuilding stakeholders, both in the field and in New York. This includes United Nations structures, regional organizations, financial institutions and bilateral donors. Information on assistance should be aggregated, analysed and, most importantly, discussed in an intergovernmental format. The result would, in our view, be useful both to the PBC itself for the elaboration of recommendations for various States on its agenda and to the Security Council in making decisions on individual States.

The reverse process is necessary as well. The Commission must relay information on peacebuilding priorities, on existing shortcomings in peacebuilding assistance and on the duplication of efforts to entities working in the field.

The PBC, within the framework of its mandate, should also make a contribution to resolving important cross-cutting issues related to peacebuilding and the United Nations system as a whole and which require multifaceted comprehensive discussions with Member States within the framework of the main bodies of the United Nations.

Currently, one such topic is civilian capacity-building. Training reserves of national civilian experts has become one of the most important fields of assistance to post-conflict States. After all, it is to resolve peacebuilding tasks, to provide assistance in rebuilding State institutions, law enforcement and

other structures shaken by conflict that civilian experts are sent to post-conflict States. The unique composition of the PBC and its country-specific configurations enables it to lend this process a high profile and a genuinely intergovernmental dimension and to utilize the South-South and trilateral cooperation mechanisms.

In practice, and despite the efforts of individual components of the Commission, it has not always been possible for the Commission to achieve harmony, even in its own work. As is often said, the right hand is simply unaware of what the left hand is doing. The organizational committee therefore needs a clear picture of what is going on in the country-specific configurations, just as a thread is needed to stitch together the various configurations.

The procedure for the preparation and taking of decisions in the configurations needs to be fine-tuned and the process of determining priorities for the activities of the Peacebuilding Fund and Peacebuilding Support Office must be made more transparent for PBC member States. Many of these problems can be resolved through technical fine-tuning, including the reorganization of working methods, especially as the roadmap for the Commission's work for this year contains the issue of working methods as a priority.

We would like to touch on an important component of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, namely the Peacebuilding Fund. This mechanism for emergency financing, which promotes the attraction of long-term resources for reconstruction and development, has proven its effectiveness. For this reason, the Russian Federation continues to contribute $2 million to the Fund annually. The provision of assistance through the Peacebuilding Fund on the basis of programmes and projects elaborated by Governments and the United Nations duly takes into account the priorities of the host country and fosters a responsible approach to using such assistance. It is gratifying that over half of the Fund's resources are allocated to States on the PBC's agenda. We continue to base our actions in that regard on the priority given to the country principle in the allocation of resources.

Mr. Mehdiyev (Azerbaijan): At the outset, I should like to thank the Colombian presidency of the Security Council and you personally, Madam Minister, for convening and presiding over this long-awaited debate on the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) on its fifth session (S/2012/70). Today's open debate provides an excellent opportunity for the Council members and the wider United Nations membership to exchange views on the important role that the Commission plays in advancing the United Nations peacebuilding efforts, and to assess progress and challenges.

I also thank the Secretary-General, the former and current Chairs of the Commission, and Mr. Joachim von Amsberg for their briefings and statements. Let me also emphasize the dedicated work of the Chairs of the country-specific configurations. We are looking forward to an informal interactive dialogue tomorrow with them, in which we will continue to reflect in a frank and detailed manner on the issues relevant to the United Nations peacebuilding efforts.

Azerbaijan has aligned itself with the statement to be delivered later today by the representative of Tunisia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Post-conflict peacebuilding does not exist in a vacuum and is dependent on a number of underlying principles. First of all, the peacebuilding process can take root and succeed only if a genuine peace, based on the norms and principles of international law, is established on the ground. Peacebuilding must not be directed at sustaining the status quo created as a result of the violation of international law. It should not be used as a tool to consolidate illegal solutions based on faits accompli.

Secondly, the Governments of countries emerging from conflicts bear the primary responsibility for peacebuilding, including for identifying their own needs and setting up national development agendas. The international community should fully respect the sovereignty, independence and national development choices of countries, and the United Nations should play the role of coordinator of international efforts and mobilizer of international resources to assist countries in formulating and advancing their national strategies.

Thirdly, peacebuilding can be truly effective only if it strives to build the national institutional capacities of post-conflict countries to sustain peace and stability. Solid national capacities and strong national ownership are key prerequisites that underpin the continuity and sustainability of peacebuilding.

Speaking of national ownership in peacebuilding, we would like to stress that in certain situations in which some parts of national territory are conflict-affected,

strategic planning and long-term preparation are required for the immediate and smooth rebuilding process to be launched once peace is achieved.

As a country suffering from conflict and foreign military occupation of its territories, Azerbaijan is working hard on the political track to achieve a negotiated settlement based on international law. Although the prospect of a speedy solution still remains elusive, the Government of Azerbaijan long ago started designing strategies and programmes for the social, economic and environmental reconstruction of its territories after their de-occupation. Simultaneously, we are increasing institutional and resource capacities in all spheres to effectively meet our goals. It goes without saying that the engagement of international expertise at the relevant phases of national peacebuilding efforts will be required.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission sought to bring coordination, coherence and integrity to the United Nations peacebuilding efforts with a view to achieving sustainable peace. By virtue of the complexity and heavy dependence of the peacebuilding process on existing circumstances in the field and changing realities globally, the Commission cannot entirely meet expectations across the whole spectrum of activities that fall within the notion of peacebuilding.

The year 2010 marked the first review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. The review laid out a number of ambitious, yet very plausible recommendations aimed at further improving the effectiveness of the Peacebuilding Commission. The Council's subsequent resolution 1947 (2010) provided political ground for all relevant United Nations actors, including above all the Commission, to take forward these recommendations in their activities. Therefore, the Commission's fifth annual report is of particular importance, since it is the first to reflect progress in the implementation of the recommendations set out by the review.

The Commission's road map for actions in 2011 provided a structured approach for the implementation of two overarching recommendations addressed to it by the review, namely, enhancing its impact in the field and strengthening its relations with key actors at Headquarters. Looking at the road map for actions in 2012, we note that this year the Commission, while focusing on further advancing its work in these directions, also recognizes the need to place particular emphasis on improving the effectiveness of its configurations.

Despite being a complex process with a variety of actors and spheres of engagement, peacebuilding constitutes an integrated system and a web of different components, with one complementing and reinforcing another. The success of the Commission's work is inextricably linked to and gauged against the achievements of its configurations on the ground. In other words, the more effective the country-specific configurations become in the field, the more valued and in-demand the Commission will be by Member States. In this regard, further strengthening the role of the country-specific configurations, as recommended by the 2010 review, could bring qualitative improvements to the effectiveness of the Commission's work and to the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

Mr. Haroon (Pakistan): It is a great pleasure to welcome you to the Security Council, Madam, and we should like to thank you for coming because, with your being here, we find that we have the opportunity to discuss the matter of peacebuilding and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), which otherwise has been pending for a longer time than many of us would care to remember. I think that it is a good omen to see you here.

We are grateful to the Secretary-General for his statement.

I would like to commend the Permanent Representative of Rwanda for ably guiding the work of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission, and specifically for presenting the report on the fifth session of the PBC (S/2012/70). I also thank my friend the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, whose is currently Chair of the PBC.

The 2011 session was the first one after the completion of review process in 2010. The process helped realign focus along three key concepts of peacebuilding. First, it created a strict prioritization of targeted areas from among the areas of security sector reform, local capacity-building and economic revitalization. Secondly, it sharpened the emphasis on development aspect of peacebuilding. Thirdly, it refined the peacekeeping-peacebuilding nexus. From this, the conclusion was also drawn that it was imperative to craft and implement peacebuilding strategies according to national priorities and policies, with complete local ownership.

Before I discuss the 2011 report, I should like to say that I find in this three-point focus some disturbing omissions. I find that perhaps we have not focused on these issues as we ought to have. I believe that, at this institution, we must seek a more integrated role for the Commission in order to make it effective.

We note that the 2011 report of the PBC points to progress on implementing the 2010 review. Some aspects of the report have a reference value, such as a record of work and meetings and country-specific configurations. The value of such reports can be enhanced through an analytical explanation — if available — of the decision-making process. Such an analysis must dovetail into enhancing our collective understanding of the various facets of peacebuilding.

Work in the country-specific configurations of the PBC is an important element of the peacebuilding narrative. Our shared understanding of the challenges and complexities of peacebuilding endeavours will improve as respective configurations take forward their work.

I would not be out of place in mentioning here that, when I was looking at the various zones of conflict that are now endowed with some sort of United Nations-inspired peace, I found the number to be far in excess of the countries that are to be reflected here today in speech and/or in the report.

Achievements of the older configurations, such as those for Burundi and Sierra Leone, as well as the challenges faced by them, will offer a useful body of knowledge for application to the emerging new configurations, such as those for Liberia and Guinea. It is important that the work of country configurations is congruent with overall peacebuilding objectives and is carried out under full national ownership. In our recent travels to these areas, we heard the oft-repeated remark of not being included in this process, instead being reported upon. That is a difference that we in this body must understand. Therefore, regular interaction among the Chairs of the country-specific configurations, the Security Council and the Organizational Committee of PBC are critical to ensuring transparency and accountability.

The countries that decide or agree to be placed on the PBC's agenda themselves have a special responsibility to put the concept of their own ownership into practice. Often, they tend to be in great awe of the United Nations and do not do so. I think that it is time for them to lead and guide the discussion from the front, and to frankly present and explain their priorities and expectations to the Commission for it to consider. It is only through their active engagement that we can drive this process forward. In turn, international partners must demonstrate political will and flexibility to respond effectively to nationally owned peacebuilding priorities.

In the general discourse on United Nations conflict management, "peacekeepers are early peacebuilders" is an oft-encountered adage. However, the linkage between peacekeeping and peacebuilding needs to be put in the proper perspective. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding are specialized activities, albeit with a common objective. They should not be subjected to competition for resources. Despite the very generous contribution of some members here and from the General Assembly, the record thus far shows that the funds are by no means commensurate with the peacebuilding process. Without that, they will not really move forward with the three objectives outlined earlier. Given that integrated mandates are increasingly becoming the norm, peacekeeping and peacebuilding tasks should be articulated clearly and adequately resourced from onset of a mission.

Clear articulation of peacebuilding tasks in a mission's mandate necessitates closer interaction between the PBC and the Security Council. Regrettably, that has not happened as it should have. It has been inadequate in whatever has happened so far. The Council must utilize the PBC's advice in framing peacebuilding mandates. The PBC's interaction with principal organs of the United Nations and the international financial institutions will be important as well to moving matters forward.

The success of United Nations peacebuilding hinges on adequate financial resources. The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) has thus far had a catalytic role in harnessing other sources of funding — without adequate success, however. But it is an essential component of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. However, given the magnitude of the challenges, the PBF alone cannot, and was not supposed to, meet the rising overall demands for peacebuilding. Avenues of resource mobilization should therefore be more vigorously explored. I would like to recall that the establishment of the peacebuilding architecture in 2005 was a direct recognition of the interlinkage between peace and development. Unless that aspect is given due attention, success will continue

to elude us in achieving and building durable peace internationally.

Besides financing, peacebuilding initiatives require necessary human resources. In that context, the Secretary-General's initiative on civilian capacity must be called extremely important for identifying expertise that could be tailored to particular needs. We hope that the ongoing follow-up on the civilian capacity process will lead to more efficiency in the field, as well as at Headquarters, where it is missing. Intergovernmental input in the process will grant it the legitimacy it seeks.

The Peacebuilding Commission, with its unique composition and specific mandate, is an important tool for post-conflict stability. We must consider ways and means of better realizing the contribution that its unique composition can make to the collective objective. We hope that the working of the PBC will improve in leaps and bounds as the global narrative on peacebuilding further evolves and as our collective response becomes more focused and, hopefully, more results-oriented.

Sir Mark Lyall Grant (United Kingdom): I thank you, Madam President, for your attendance at this morning's meeting and for convening this debate. In particular, I am grateful to Colombia for focusing the Council's attention on the important issue of peacebuilding and on the role of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). We think that this is a very timely debate, especially following the Council's recent visit to West Africa. We thank the Secretary-General, Ambassadors Gasana and Momen and Mr. Von Amsberg for their comprehensive briefings.

Peacebuilding remains a central focus for the United Kingdom. We believe that the Peacebuilding Commission has a potentially important role to play within the wider context of United Nations efforts to support countries emerging from conflict. But, as Ambassador Momen rightly said today, the Peacebuilding Commission has not yet fulfilled that potential.

As Council members will be aware, following our visit to West Africa I wrote to the Council President on 12 June with some ideas on how we might strengthen the role of the PBC in the countries visited, and how we might improve the quality of the interaction between the Council and the PBC Chairs. I am grateful to the Colombian presidency for scheduling an interactive dialogue tomorrow with the relevant PBC country configurations, and for this wider open debate today.

For now, I would like to highlight three areas where we see an important added value for the role of the PBC. They are, first, supporting strong national ownership of peacebuilding; secondly, promoting coherence in international support for peacebuilding; and thirdly, providing informed briefings for the Security Council.

First, on national ownership, as we know, the primary responsibility for peacebuilding rests with post-conflict Governments themselves. That means, as Ambassador Haroon has just reminded us, national leadership and ownership of the process from start to finish. But national leaders should not feel that they are in it alone. The international community has an important role to play by helping post-conflict countries build national capacity to lead, and by helping to strengthen and underpin the political will necessary to consolidate peace.

We do not have to invent this sort of partnership from scratch. A number of conflict-affected countries have come together and produced, after some two years of effort, an agenda for how the international system should partner them as they build peace, based on the core principles of national leadership and ownership. This agenda, the so-called New Deal, is one we should actively support.

The Peacebuilding Commission should be working with the countries on its agenda in line with the principles of the New Deal. That means helping to ensure that national Governments are in the driver's seat and that their leadership is not undermined. But it also means holding national actors to account for their commitment to peacebuilding. The PBC should be a supportive partner, but also a robust one, and should not shirk engaging in discussion about the tough issues and political choices that post-conflict countries face, including, for example, on national reconciliation, the rule of law and human rights.

Secondly, as the Secretary-General and Ambassador Momen highlighted, the coherence of the international effort is absolutely vital. We simply cannot overburden countries emerging from conflict with individual agency turf wars or duplication of effort, or major gaps in support for key peacebuilding sectors. We must ensure that our own efforts as an international community are coherent. This is especially true for the United Nations. We need strong, effective links between United Nations missions and country teams, so that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

That requires good planning, a clear division of labour and strong leadership on the ground. I welcome the fact that the new Deputy Secretary-General has stressed that message in his first few days in his new job.

The PBC can play a vital role here. It can support the countries on its agenda in mapping international assistance, identifying gaps and lobbying international actors to improve coherence and predictability of support. It can even name and shame when international actors are not lining up in support of a coherent, effective international effort. In that regard, the PBC has a critical role to play in bringing to bear the perspective of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, which play such a central role in helping many countries restart their economies in the aftermath of conflict. We warmly welcome the participation of the World Bank in today's debate.

Finally, let me turn to the relationship between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. I believe that the PBC can add genuine value to Council deliberations for the countries on its agenda by complementing the briefings given by senior United Nations officials on the ground. For example, the PBC could provide the Council with an overview of the effectiveness of international support to the countries on its agenda. It can elucidate on the kinds of issues I have talked about today: the coherence, inclusivity and degree of national ownership of peacebuilding in a given country. For its part, the Council could be more direct in requesting specific information from the PBC Chairs, especially in the run-up to consultations or mandate renewals. That would enable the Commission to widen the Council's field of vision across the full range of peacebuilding challenges and actors.

Mr. Li Baodong (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I would like to thank Colombia for its initiative in holding this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding, and Foreign Minister Holguín Cuéllar for presiding over today's meeting. I would also like to thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon; Ambassador Gasana and Ambassador Momen, the Permanent Representatives of Rwanda and Bangladesh, respectively; and Mr. Von Amsberg of the World Bank for their presence.

China greatly appreciates the remarkable achievements of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) last year. As the first entity within the United Nations system in charge of coordinating post-conflict peacebuilding, the PBC has made efforts to implement its mandate, pursuant to the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, and has played an important role in advancing peacebuilding in countries emerging from conflict. At the same time, since peacebuilding is a long-term, complex and arduous task, the PBC confronts many challenges in its work. I would like to make the following four comments.

First, the PBC and all relevant parties should fully respect the national ownership of the countries concerned. Post-conflict States bear primary responsibility for building peace in their own countries. In helping such countries to build peace, the Commission should respect their will and try to help them strengthen national capacity-building, including by enhancing their capacity in the areas of civil administration and national governance. The PBC should also proactively strengthen its partnership with the countries on its agenda in a constructive manner.

Secondly, the Commission should help post-conflict countries mobilize the necessary resources in accordance with their national situation and specific priorities. The priorities of post-conflict peacebuilding are stabilizing the security situation, promoting political reconciliation, and strengthening the development of democracy. At the same time, root problems that threaten peace and security, particularly issues of social and economic development, should also be tackled. The PBC should act as an important platform to help coordinate international assistance and mobilization of resources. We also hope that the Peacebuilding Fund will be able to provide greater support for the work of post-conflict peacebuilding.

Thirdly, the Commission should enhance its coordination and cooperation with the chief United Nations entities, international financial institutions and regional organizations. We hope that it will build on its coordination and coherence with such major organs of the United Nations as the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in an effort to explore effective means of assisting post-conflict countries in building peace. The unique advantages in the field of peacebuilding possessed by such financial institutions as the World Bank and by regional and subregional organizations, such as the African Union, should be tapped further in order to achieve more concrete results in peacebuilding among countries emerging from conflict.

Last, but not least, we believe that the PBC should continue to strive to improve its working methods and enhance efficiency. Peacebuilding covers a broad area and involves complex and burdensome tasks. The PBC should continue to improve its internal institution-building, and actively collect experiences and best practices. At the same time, it should put more emphasis on results achieved in the field in specific countries, including using such resources as various United Nations projects, funds and peacekeeping missions, while strengthening coordination and cooperation and avoiding duplication.

Mr. Moraes Cabral (Portugal) (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you, Madam President, for presiding over the Council. It is always an honour and a pleasure to have you with us. I would like to congratulate the Colombian presidency of the Council for having organized this important debate. I should also like to thank you, Madam, for the excellent concept note (S/2012/511, annex) that your delegation prepared.

(*spoke in English*)

I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his important statement, as well as our colleagues from Rwanda and Bangladesh for their very useful briefings and for their leadership. I also wish to say a word of appreciation to Mr. Von Amsberg for his presentation.

Portugal naturally shares the positions that will be presented later during this debate by Ambassador Mayr-Harting on behalf of the European Union.

There is no denying that, over the past six years, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has established itself as a unique actor within the United Nations architecture for post-conflict peace consolidation. The report (S/2012/70) we are considering today testifies to that effect and provides a comprehensive account of how the Commission and its various configurations have evolved and developed new forms of engagement with fragile countries, as well as with the wider donor community. Of course, much can still and should be done.

One distinctive aspect of the PBC that Portugal particularly values is the way it brings together security and development as interrelated elements of peace consolidation. Making sure that those two dimensions are treated in an integrated manner from the early stages of peacekeeping requires bringing our political, development, security and humanitarian instruments into a single consistent framework. In each of the countries where it is involved — including in the four configurations that Portugal is a part of — the PBC certainly contributes to the United Nations effort to devise such a framework.

The PBC's singularity derives also from its membership, which brings together Member States and international organizations, and from its engagement with national actors in the definition of peacebuilding priorities. Its approach, based on mutual engagement between the PBC and the authorities of the countries on its agenda, provides a strong incentive for national ownership of peace consolidation processes.

The issue at stake here today is how to make the best use of those singular features of the PBC in order to ensure a more coherent and effective United Nations presence on the ground, but also greater visibility for the PBC's work. As the annual report indicates, one of the PBC's main tasks is the mobilization of donors' resources and the identification of financing gaps and of the priorities for international assistance. Yet, that should translate into the actual work being carried out on the ground. Besides the regular planning and articulation with national authorities, we strongly believe that the PBC should, early on, be more systematically involved with other actors, first and foremost with United Nations agencies, but also with bilateral partners, international financial institutions and regional organizations. By engaging with the different partners, the PBC can play a very important role in bridging potential gaps between what each actor is doing. In that respect, the partnership established with the African Development Bank is a very positive step, which will hopefully yield concrete results in the near future.

Another crucial aspect is that of political dialogue. The statements of mutual agreement, as well as the visits by the Chairs of the country-specific configurations, constitute excellent opportunities for conveying political messages regarding the situation in the countries on the PBC's agenda. Yet, we must admit that more needs to be done to articulate the political role of the PBC configuration Chairs with that of other United Nations actors, namely, the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, in order to avoid duplication or, even worse, contradictions.

Priority areas for PBC intervention should also be carefully considered, taking into account the

mandate of United Nations missions on the ground. While the current trend for a stronger focus by the PBC configurations on security sector reform (SSR) activities is, in our view, positive development, it is critical to ensure that such focus does not duplicate the work carried out by United Nations missions whose mandates already include SSR assistance as priority tasks.

The same applies, to a large extent, to initiatives aimed at promoting the effective participation of women in political transition and economic recovery. We value the initiatives of the PBC to tackle what we believe is a fundamental aspect of peace consolidation in the various countries on its agenda, and can only encourage the different configurations to work with the missions on the ground, as well as with relevant United Nations organs and international partners, to ensure better coordination of existing activities.

Still on the issue of priority areas, we believe that recent debates on cross-national issues, such as the ones on transnational organized crime in West Africa, are very promising and represent an attempt to provide a regional dimension to the work of the PBC. In that respect, we encourage the configurations to work closely with United Nations regional offices in the implementation of concrete projects for combating organized crime.

The answer to the issues I have identified here require a broader refection on the relation between the PBC and other organs of the United Nations, in particular the Security Council. The PBC's annual report acknowledges some progress in the interaction between the two organs and provides recommendations on how that relationship can be strengthened.

We should work collectively to improve our working methods in order to allow us, on a regular basis, to draw upon the advice of the Chairs of country-specific configurations. The interactive dialogue to be held tomorrow represents a positive step in that direction, but there is certainly room for the Council to seek, and make a better use of, the PBC's advice, especially when discussing the renewal of mandates, but also as an early warning for potential setbacks in peace consolidation in specific countries.

In conclusion, as always, Portugal stands ready to engage in an open and creative discussion on ways to advance the PBC's contributions to more efficient and integrated action on the part of the international community throughout the various stages of post-conflict and peace consolidation in the countries involved. The success of the PBC in fulfilling its functions represents our collective success towards achieving sustainable peace.

Mr. Mashabane (South Africa): We wish to welcome you, Madam President, and we want to thank you for presiding over this meeting. We thank the Secretary-General for his briefing. In general, Madam President, we wish to thank your delegation for organizing this debate. We also thank the outgoing Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana of Rwanda, for the outstanding work done during his term. We would like to congratulate Ambassador Abulkalam Abdul Momen of Bangladesh on his assumption of the important role of Chair of the Commission. We wish him all the best and pledge our support to his leadership.

In the intervening period between the 2005 World Summit, which took the decision to establish the peacebuilding architecture, and today's debate, we have had discussions about the relevance or the value that the PBC brings to the international peace and security equation. Among others, the principal questions that have been asked include, first, what is the added value of the PBC? Secondly, what is the relevance of the PBC? Thirdly, what is the role of the PBC? Those are critical questions that the United Nations system ponders every day, sometimes with limited answers.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission was a major milestone in recognizing the nexus and interrelatedness between security and development. Ideally, the Commission should be a premier United Nations body for dealing with the challenges of security and development. It could serve well as a point of convergence between the different organs of the United Nations with Charter mandates.

Nonetheless, South Africa would like to say from the outset that we believe that the PBC remains a relevant and critical tool in the broad realm of conflict prevention and peace consolidation. It cannot be an over-exaggeration to purport that without the efforts of the PBC in the countries on its agenda, the situation would have been different to what it is currently, that is, that we could have seen those countries relapse into conflict.

In that context, our objective analysis of the PBC further leads us to conclude that the Commission is still

evolving and that it has not yet reached its full potential. All six countries on its agenda recently witnessed a reversal in their democratic processes, in particular in Guinea-Bissau. A reflection on the achievement and challenges of the PBC is therefore crucial as we continue sharpening the tools of this important body. It is our well-considered view that we should not shy away from continuous reflection on the need to strengthen the Commission's capacity with the necessary tools, skills and expertise. That may well mean differentiating between the notion of peacebuilding and the nature and configuration of the actual structure that is the Commission.

Today's discussion should also be seen as an important opportunity to recommit ourselves to the pledge that we took when we unanimously adopted the resolutions that created the peacebuilding architecture, in 2005. One critical moment in which the international community intervened in the life of the Commission was the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, which provided concrete recommendations on how to enhance the work of the Commission. My delegation is pleased to learn, as stated in the report (S/2012/70) under discussion, that there is a growing momentum to implement relevant recommendations developed during that review.

South Africa is encouraged at the progress made by the Peacebuilding Commission and the country-specific configurations in the countries on its agenda. While we welcome those positive developments, we also believe that more can and should be done. In that regard, I would like to focus on the issue of enhancing the utility of the country-specific configurations.

We believe that the membership of the country-specific configurations should be encouraged to take on specific responsibilities, ranging from political to financial support. One of the main tasks of the PBC is to provide political attention to, and advocacy for, the countries on its agenda. In that context, the members of the configurations should be encouraged to bring their influence to bear and to provide the necessary political backbone to the countries on whose configurations they sit.

Furthermore, membership in those configurations should not be simply a label of prestige for its members, but should come with responsibility. Therefore, as recommended in the 2010 review, in order to improve the PBC's effectiveness on the ground, the Chairs of configurations should not be personalized, so as to allow the country from which the configuration Chair comes or that the Chair represents at the United Nations to take the lead in the process, or at least to be actively engaged. That could be even easier and more effective where the country that the Chair represents at the United Nations has diplomatic representation in the country on the PBC agenda. It is a fact that we have not yet reflected on whether the composition, which is currently made up of State representatives based here in New York, is the only way to make up the Commission, or whether we should be flexible and open-minded about expertise residing elsewhere, whether in the civil service or in the private sector.

With respect to coordination and strategic partnerships, we believe that increased coordination is crucial for ensuring effective international efforts in post-conflict situations and international interventions. United Nations efforts are often fragmented and face a struggle to pull the critical resources together and maximize the strength of collective efforts. Over the years, the PBC, as part of that United Nations machinery, has also had to struggle to coordinate resources that are necessary to strengthen and sustain new peace. In that regard, South Africa strongly supports the call for greater coherence, coordination and interaction between various United Nations organs and agencies, especially in the field. Greater coordination has the potential to avert duplication of efforts and maximize output at a time of limited and constantly shrinking resources.

The interaction with the World Bank and donor organizations is welcome and should be sustained. We also welcome the dynamic partnership between the Commission and the African Development Bank. However, we would encourage cooperation with the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa as well. We further welcome the engagement with the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of African States.

Having recognized the inextricable link between security and development, we welcome the growing relationship between the Commission and the Economic and Social Council. As regards coordination in the field, the PBC should be given the mandate to be the sole convener or coordinator of at least the United Nations peacebuilding interventions in countries on its agenda. In consultation with other stakeholders, the United Nations should ensure that all other agencies,

including civil society, should channel their efforts through the PBC at the country level in the interest of avoiding possible duplication and competition for space and attention. The integrated peacebuilding Mission in Sierra Leone, where the PBC involvement was aligned with the priorities of the Government through its national Agenda for Change, could be used as an example.

We believe that the relationship between the Security Council and the PBC is perhaps the most important one, given the mandates of both entities. The PBC report notes that, "The relationship with the Security Council has continued to develop during the reporting period." (*S/2012/70, para. 24*) That positive development is evidenced, inter alia, by the introduction of informal interactions between the Council and the Chairs of the country configurations.

We would once again like to stress the need for the Council to consider flexible working methods so as to enable the PBC to play its role effectively in advising the Council on post-conflict situations. Whereas the Council has incorporated peacebuilding tasks in virtually all, if not all its peacekeeping mandates, we nevertheless emphasize that the advice of the PBC should be sought at all times where it is deemed relevant. We also reiterate that peacekeeping and peacebuilding should be mutually reinforcing in the pursuance of lasting peace in post-conflict countries.

With respect to resource mobilization, it goes without saying that peacebuilding in post-conflict countries requires a substantive injection of resources. In that regard, we believe that timely, sustainable and predictable financing remains a crucial ingredient in realizing the objectives of peacebuilding. We therefore emphasize the need for the United Nations to consider utilizing sustainable mechanisms as a means of kick-starting peacebuilding activities in countries emerging from conflict, including assessed contributions, especially with regard to quick-impact projects. Such projects are critical for the consolidation of peace dividends so as to avert a total relapse into conflict.

Post-conflict countries often have weak human and institutional capacities for peacebuilding. South Africa emphasizes the importance of building local institutional and human capacities and of providing training to create new, and enhance already existing, capacities. We welcome the process led by the United Nations Development Programme to strengthen the United Nations system-wide approach to capacity development for peacebuilding. In developing such capacities, we cannot over-emphasize the importance of forging partnerships at the local, regional and subregional levels in order to exploit the unique advantages inherent in human capacities at those levels. In that context, the notion of developing and tapping into civilian capacities, particularly from the global South, is crucial. In developing those capacities, national ownership should be emphasized at all the stages of the peacebuilding process.

To conclude, South Africa reiterates its commitment to the work of the PBC. We believe that the Commission has a critical role to play in terms of conflict prevention, including in the early detection of root and proximate causes, as well as in identifying potential triggers of conflict. Africa has benefited from the efforts of the PBC. We want to see a more robust, agile and resourced body that will help the continent avert conflict and consolidate fragile peace where it is created.

Mr. Loulichki (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Columbia for her excellent contribution to today's discussion, which is a very important one for my country and the other members of the Council. I would also like to express my gratitude for the fifth annual report on the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2012/70), as well as to commend the Secretary-General on his personal involvement in strengthening the United Nations role in peacekeeping. I also wish to thank as Ambassadors Eugène-Richard Gasana and Abulkalam Abdul Momem, along with World Bank Vice-President Joachim von Amsberg, for their edifying presentations.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement that will delivered later in the meeting by the representative of Tunisia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Post-conflict management is so important that its outcome, whether for good or ill, can either save a country or condemn it to instability, as examples drawn from recent experience amply prove. In particular, they show us that the bases of peacebuilding begin to take shape as soon as peace is established and that they play a determining role in the country's process of transition and transformation. Before they become the responsibility of the international community, those transitions and changes are first and foremost the responsibility of the authorities of the affected

countries. Ownership on the part of the stakeholders concerned in post-conflict countries is a sine qua non condition for any successful peacebuilding initiative. Such national ownership requires prioritizing actions to ensure that the stabilization process goes forward, without backsliding. In our view, those priorities are security, the rule of law, national reconciliation and socio-economic development.

Clearly, no country emerging from conflict can build peace without timely, substantive and sustained help from the international community, including its neighbouring States and the regional and subregional organizations it belongs to. The United Nations system is called on to play a central and catalytic role in peacebuilding, given the confidence it inspires, the credibility it brings and the collective knowledge it has gathered over decades. Within the United Nations architecture, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has demonstrated its usefulness, its relevance and its ability to turn the tide in the initial stages of peacebuilding.

The establishment of the Commission, six years ago, decisively marked the beginning of a new United Nations approach to international peace and security and development. By virtue of its multifaceted nature, that new organ filled an institutional vacuum, addressing issues of security, development and aid in an integrated way. Because of the wide representation of its membership, the Commission is a credible entity for coordination and the sharing of best practices in helping countries emerging from conflict.

I would like to focus today on two crucial issues that seem to me to demand special attention, namely, funding and coordination. The PBC cannot fully reach its potential and make a difference on the ground if it lacks the funding necessary for its work, as all speakers today have stressed. The funding it can count on has to date fallen short of the urgent needs of the countries on its agenda. That affects not only its effectiveness but also its visibility as a peacebuilding actor, as members of the Council saw in West Africa last May. We agree with the Working Group on Lessons Learned that the Commission would benefit from exploring new, innovative and dependable means of funding its projects while strengthening its relationships with other elements of the United Nations system, international financial institutions and regional development banks, such as the African Development Bank and the Islamic Development Bank.

The important work done by the Working Group on Lessons Learned in mapping possible areas of cooperation among the various country configurations should be encouraged. It must be said that the Commission's growing appeal for countries emerging from conflict is often not accompanied by awareness of or gratitude for its work. Communication lines must therefore absolutely be established to give greater visibility to the PBC, to its role in countries benefiting from its assistance and to the contributions it can make elsewhere, as underlined by the Secretary-General in his opening statement.

The Organization enjoys significant human, technical and financial resources that would benefit from being focused along the lines of the PBC. It is therefore crucial to increase coherence. The contribution of regional actors and subregional organizations is of great importance to achieving peace, stability and development for countries emerging from conflict. We believe that triangular cooperation is an approach that the Commission should further explore, especially when it comes to South-South cooperation. That would make it possible to adapt methods to local circumstances and to optimize the use of available resources.

With the establishment of the Guinea configuration, in 2011, the number of PBC country configurations rose to six. We would like to take this opportunity to commend the current Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and his predecessor for the practical and important work they have done.

Given the geographic proximity of many countries emerging from conflict and the similar socio-economic and security challenges they face, we believe that the time to establish regional configurations has come. Such areas of focus, for example along the Mano River, which runs through Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone, or in the Sahel or the Great Lakes region, would make for better coordination of action and increased coherence in peacebuilding operations at the subregional level. In the light of recent developments in the Sahel, we believe the PBC should come to the aid of the countries of the Sahel-Sahara Strip that are either in conflict or emerging from institutional crises.

Strengthening the role of the Peacebuilding Commission within the United Nations architecture is of particular importance to sustain the successes achieved in many countries on the African continent. The relationship between the Commission and the

Security Council should be further strengthened. In that context, we commend the regular invitations extended by the Council to the Chairs of the configurations to share their perspectives and assessments of the countries on the Commission's agenda. At the same time, we appreciate and support strengthened cooperation between the Commission and the Economic and Social Council and between the Commission and international and continental financial institutions.

Mr. Rosenthal (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, Madam President, allow me to say that we are pleased to see you presiding over this meeting. We appreciate your personal presence, we appreciate the delegation of Colombia's having organized this open debate and we appreciate the excellent concept paper you have prepared to guide our deliberations (S/2012/511, annex). We also wish to express our thanks to the Secretary-General for his statement and to the secretariat for the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2012/70), which covers the proceedings of its fifth session.

Guatemala was a Member State of the Commission during the period under consideration and even had the honour of holding one of the Vice-Chairs. We therefore can relate to the contents of the report, in both its informational and analytical aspects. We especially appreciate the detailed information on each of the countries belonging to specific configurations when it comes to the main functions of the Commission, namely, political advocacy and support, resource mobilization and fostering coherence.

We are grateful for the statements made by Ambassadors Gasana and Momen and by Mr. Von Amsberg of the World Bank, whom we welcome here today.

What gave life to the Peacebuilding Commission in 2005 was a very simple idea, conceptually speaking. The United Nations had accumulated 60 years of solid experience in both peacekeeping and development. The time had come to capitalize on those experiences, crystallizing them in a specialized entity that would apply the lessons learned in both areas to countries emerging from conflict — in other words, in peacebuilding processes.

A corollary to that idea is reflected in the institutional aspect, since three of the principal inter-governmental organs — the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council — addressed different aspects of peacemaking or peacebuilding. What could be better than creating a specialized body linked to those three organs that would foster greater coherence within the United Nations system in addressing specifically the situation of countries emerging from conflict?

As will be recalled, the Commission was created through concurrent resolutions 60/180 of the General Assembly and 1645 (2005) of the Security Council, after a relatively prolonged negotiation period. Furthermore, the possibility of modifying the forum was agreed to, by establishing a five-year review process.

Consequently, in 2010 three of our colleagues — from South Africa, Mexico and Ireland — provided the Council with their report (S/2010/393, annex), which tries to reflect the opposing views within the United Nations regarding the performance of the Commission. The main conclusion of the three co-facilitators can be characterized in a single phrase: the hopes that accompanied the creation of the Commission "have yet to be realized". The report contains recommendations that seek to close the gap between expectations and results. The General Assembly and the Security Council so aligned themselves in adopting General Assembly resolution 65/7 and Security Council resolution 1947 (2010).

In a brief statement it is neither possible nor appropriate to address the multiple issues raised both in the co-facilitators' report and in the Commission's report before us. For that reason we are grateful to the Colombian presidency for its concept paper, which ends with three questions that will help us to focus our remaining remarks. I shall be brief.

First, how can the Commission realize its potential to provide added value to the web of institutions dedicated to similar roles? In our judgment, if the Commission would fully comply with its mandate its added value would be self-evident, since, contrary to the question's implication, its role is unique. It does not need to compete with other forums to gain attention or space. The way to highlight its role is to improve its capacity to create partnerships within and outside of the United Nations. Within the Organization, owing to the constitution of its membership, it can be said that the Commission is a product of the three principal intergovernmental organs I have mentioned, and as such forms a hinge between them, thereby strengthening the role of each.

Furthermore, the Commission represents a meeting point among the Security Council — whose mandate is limited to maintaining international peace and security — the General Assembly and, above all, the Economic and Social Council, which have mandates in the area of development and democratic governance. Of course, the dividing line between peace-making and peacebuilding is hazy, but precisely for that reason a good understanding between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission would enhance compliance with each organ's mandates, especially in the field.

However, our perception is that in practice each forum carries out its activities separately. In other words, the frequent invocations of coordinated efforts are more rhetorical than operational. That must end and give way to genuine alliances. The same can be said regarding alliances outside of the United Nations, especially among the international financial institutions. Some progress has been achieved in that connection, especially regarding the World Bank and the African Development Bank. But we believe that there is still a long way to go.

Secondly, what tools should the Commission utilize to expand its potential in each of its three main functions to have a greater impact in the field? In our brief experience in the Commission, we perceived the greatest potential at the level of the country configurations, which have clearly had a positive impact on the ground, but could be strengthened even more. The leadership of the configurations plays a critical role, and so the selection of their Chairs merits special care. Theu do not necessarily have to be limited to the pool of United Nations accredited Permanent Representatives; one could also consider notable persons from outside of the Organization.

The other instrument that clearly has had an important impact, with intrinsic value as well as a catalytic element for the other root functions of the Commission, is the Peacebuilding Fund. A call should be made to the entire donor community to replenish the Fund with fresh resources, since, in our opinion, and as the Secretary-General indicated this morning, it has been the most successful element of the United Nations efforts in the area of peacebuilding.

Thirdly, what can Member States contribute, individually and collectively, to empower the Commission and bring it closer to meeting its core objectives? The Commission, like any intergovernmental organ, is the product of the responsible guidance and support of the Member States and the enlightened support of its secretariat. Up to now, the demands to expand the number of country configurations has collided with the finite capacity of the secretariat to handle a larger volume of activity. In other words, we must support the Secretariat and continue to support our active participation in this forum with the dedication, care and, I would even say, sacrifice that many countries have demonstrated over the past five years.

The Peacebuilding Commission has become one of those cases that we frequently encounter that is characterized by the "glass half full" syndrome. We believe that there is the potential to fill the other half of the proverbial glass and transform the Commission into what it was expected to be when our Heads of State and Government adopted the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1). Both the report of the co-facilitators of 2010 and the most recent report of the Commission suggest ways to achieve this goal.

Mr. Vinay Kumar (India): Let me begin by welcoming you, Madam President, to the Security Council and by thanking the Colombian delegation for organizing today's open debate. Our thanks also go to the Secretary-General, Ambassadors Gasana and Momen, and the Vice-President of the World Bank for their valuable statements. I also want to put on rèco· 1our appreciation for the useful concept paper (S/2012/511, annex) provided by your delegation, Madam, to anchor our deliberations today.

The nature of conflicts today is very different from what it was in the past. Their intra-State nature, the need to manage natural resources, transnational organized crime, illicit trafficking in drugs and weapons, and regional dimensions demand an approach that is capable of building upon the gains of stabilization. Building the institutions of core governance, promoting youth employment, ensuring transitional justice and national reconciliation, providing electoral support and constitution-building are tasks that need the coherent and sustained assistance of the international community. This in turn requires political will, the allocation of adequate resources and readiness for long-term engagement.

It is in this context that peacebuilding, once described as the missing middle between peacekeeping and durable peace, assumes importance. The setting

up of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) six years ago reflected the collective desire of the international community to assist post-conflict countries on a long-term basis in their transition. Despite its advisory role, the Commission and its Organizing Committee have done work worthy of our commendation in mainstreaming peacebuilding.

Given the wide range of tasks the PBC is expected to administer, it is not surprising that it faces several challenges. In our view, the willingness of the international community to provide adequate resources is the first and necessary condition for successful peacebuilding efforts in post-conflict countries.

Secondly, greater coherence among various United Nations organs under the aegis of the Commission is required to enhance its ability to carry its agenda forward. In this connection, I would like to mention that the organizational context of peacebuilding continues to lack uniformity. Some peacebuilding efforts are being managed by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, others by the Department of Political Affairs, and yet others by the United Nations Resident Coordinator system. Clearly, peacebuilding policymaking needs to be suitably addressed in this Organization today.

It is also important to keep in mind that peace in post-conflict societies cannot be restored unless citizens are free from fear and want and institutions of governance perform effectively. The capacity for effective governance, in turn, depends on the existence of institutions that enable these authorities to respond effectively to people's aspirations. This general political aphorism is substantiated by the experience of the international community in its peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts over the past two decades.

We therefore think that the core institutions of governance are the key to sustainable peace. They must be rooted locally rather than being imposed from above. Their local relevance and inclusiveness will make all the difference in the governance process. It is therefore important for the PBC to align its objectives with national priorities and ensure that all plans and programmes are implemented under national leadership and through national institutions so that gains are sustainable, if slow. The Commission must also draw from the experiences that are the most relevant to the prevailing socio-economic conditions in the countries on its agenda. An effective measure of the success of peacebuilding efforts will be the Commission's success in promoting inclusive political processes, national reconciliation and security sector reforms.

Peacebuilding anchored firmly in the overall peace process will deliver the best results. This requires the international community to make available a predictable and appropriate level of resources over extended periods. Our advocacy must be accompanied by matching commitments in resources.

The United Nations capacity to assist national institutions is contingent upon the Secretariat and the funds and programmes having the skills and expertise that are relevant to these societies. We believe that the Secretary-General's review of civilian capacity is a step towards making that process inclusive and representative. We firmly believe that the nimbleness of recruitment and deployment is not a sufficient condition for performance delivery.

Those willing to invest their lives in the field must be valued. Our in-house experts who have gained valuable insights by spending time in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Darfur, the Sudan and other challenging locations should be the pivots of all our endeavours. Our efforts, at the same time, must be demand-driven and nimble in order to respond the changing times, rather than supply-driven. Our ways of selecting police and military officers on secondment need to be simplified. Communication methods with Member States have stagnated and are outdated in this regard. The representative nature of our institutions will ensure the collective spirit of our enterprise, including in the Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that, as a responsible global citizen with extensive nation-building experience that is very relevant for countries on the PBC agenda, India will not be found wanting in responding to the challenges of the peacebuilding process, including under the aegis of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Mr. Araud (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank you, Madam President, for your presence among us here today, and Colombia for having organized this open debate on peacebuilding. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General; the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh; his predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Rwanda; and the representative of the World Bank.

France associates itself with the statement to be made on behalf of the European Union.

We note today that, despite the 2010 review, the role of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is still being defined. I would therefore like to make three comments concerning this matter.

First, the primary role of the PBC is to identify, together with the States concerned, the needs on the ground and the stakeholders who are already involved. Contact with those in the field offers a picture of the needs on the ground. The work carried out in the case of Guinea is an example of this. The mapping exercise carried out by Luxembourg and Japan provides us with a precise, quantifiable picture of the existing shortcomings and projects needed to remedy them. This exercise deserves to be repeated in other country-specific configurations of the PBC.

The identification of the most pressing areas should be the result of an in-depth dialogue with the relevant State. To facilitate this dialogue, there are integrated peacebuilding offices in a number of post-conflict countries, such as Burundi and the Central African Republic. The country-specific configuration of the Commission must be in close contact with these offices, and their exchanges must be fluid. That dialogue will be effective only if links with the field are strengthened. As was demonstrated by the Security Council's visit to western Africa, the PBC is sometimes lacking in visibility in States in the region, in particular Sierra Leone.

Once the work to identify needs has been completed, it is important for the PBC to be able to play its political supporting role. On the one hand, an important element of the tasks entrusted to the Peacebuilding Commission is that of advocacy, especially for resource mobilization. On the other hand, the PBC should open a dialogue with the authorities of countries on its agenda in order to ask them to take specific commitments and follow up with results on the ground.

The signing of mutual commitments or peacebuilding plans with a State is not in itself enough to guarantee that they will in fact be implemented. For example, the peacebuilding plan for South Sudan is blocked for now as a result of budgetary austerity. In a number of situations, States do not possess the means to cover and fully participate in all projects under way. It is therefore essential to establish priorities and to be realistic.

Finally, the key element of the role of the Peacebuilding Commission is coordination. The PBC was designed as a platform for contact between the various members of the international community, including the international financial institutions, which play a decisive role in this regard. Partnerships with them must be developed. Coordination is a long-term endeavour. To ensure the sustainability of the international community's commitment, various efforts aimed at reviewing the topic have been launched, such as, inter alia, the review of civilian capacities. The issue of partnership development lies at the very heart of that review. We believe that that approach provides us with the best hope for a long-term commitment.

The international community must not create conditions of dependence where a State is kept on life support, but rather conditions for recovery. An excellent option is the drawing up of contracts such as the New Deal for International Engagement in Fragile States developed at the 2011 Forum on Aid Effectiveness, in Busan, which involved defining a State's commitment and so involves it in the project. Initiatives aimed at promoting the recovery of a viable economic fabric must be especially encouraged. The joint informal event of the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission in June on partnerships for youth job creation in States emerging from conflict was useful. That approach should also be reflected on the ground in each State on the PBC's agenda.

I will conclude by underscoring that to bring a coordinated response to post-conflict situations and to make sustainable any return to peace and stability, the Commission must work as a flexible and responsive mechanism, one bringing all players together in a joint action plan. It therefore behoves us to be especially vigilant with regard to the risks of bureaucratization of this young institution.

Mr. Wittig (Germany) Madam President, let me begin by thanking you, Ambassador Néstor Osorio and your whole delegation for today's important and timely initiative and for preparing an excellent concept note for our debate (S/2012/511, annex). Let me also thank the Secretary-General for his briefing, as well as the current and former Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and Vice-President Von Amsberg of the World Bank for their insightful statements. Let me also commend Assistant Secretary-General Judy Cheng-Hopkins for her important work at the helm of the Peacebuilding Support Office.

Germany aligns itself with the statement to be delivered by the observer of the European Union later on in today's debate.

We are here today not only to discuss the latest annual report of the PBC (S/2012/70), but also to speak in more general terms about how we can enhance the role of the Commission within the United Nations system, and in particular the impact that it has in the field. In our view, the PBC has not yet entirely realized its full potential. What can be done better? The concept paper prepared by the Colombian presidency raises important questions. The PBC's engagement with a country needs to be flexible and has to evolve on the basis of a continuous assessment. Our approaches must be context-specific; there is no single approach that will fit all situations. However, there are a few overarching points and principles that seem important to us.

First, we need to clarify what the role of the PBC is and set realistic expectations. It seems that the PBC's success has often been measured only by its capacity to mobilize resources. Resource mobilization, including by mobilizing non-traditional donors, is indeed a key role of the PBC. But it needs to be clear that that is not its only role. Supporting countries politically as they emerge from conflict and fostering coherence among international actors are other core tasks outlined in the PBC's founding resolutions. Eligibility for funding by the Peacebuilding Fund is therefore also linked to a country's national commitment to a political peacebuilding process. To marshal resources is not an isolated task but has to go hand in hand with a credible and nationally owned political process. The PBC can only be successful if there is a genuine political commitment by the national Government in question to a political peacebuilding process.

Secondly, effective political support of countries on the PBC's agenda can only work if there is close cooperation between the PBC and other key actors on the ground, namely, the executive representatives and Special Representatives of the Secretary-General. The roles and responsibilities of the different actors must be clearly outlined in order to avoid overlap. The first meeting between the PBC country configuration Chairs and the Secretary-General's representatives for countries on the PBC's agenda, which took place in New York in May, was an important step in the right direction. In our view, such a dialogue needs to take place on a much more regular basis. The comparative advantage of the PBC compared with United Nations missions on the ground is its intergovernmental structure, which should allow it to lend the the Secretary-General's representatives additional political weight.

Thirdly, the PBC must make better use of the political leverage of its individual members. PBC member States need to become better at assisting the PBC country configuration Chairs in their work. Members of the PBC's Organizational Committee and the PBC country configurations have a responsibility to support the PBC so that it can have a true impact on the ground. The PBC was created as a body composed of members of different United Nations bodies, including seven members of the Security Council, precisely for the reason that those members bring their political weight and experience from other bodies to the PBC's activities. The intergovernmental nature of the PBC needs to be much better used in order to support the countries on its agenda.

Fourthly, the PBC needs to maintain stronger and more regular rapport with other key partners in the field, especially with major donors such as the World Bank, active bilateral donors and other relevant international actors. I therefore welcome the presence of Vice-President Von Amsberg of the World Bank at today's meeting. His statement on the improved coordination between the World Bank and the PBC in post-conflict situations is reassuring. We encourage both sides to make full use of their potential for future cooperation. It is only through a regular, strong rapport that gaps and overlaps will be identified, be they in resourcing or in civilian capacity-building.

Fifthly, we believe that there need to be more interactive and dynamic relations between the PBC and the Council. We welcome the fact that the Chairs of the PBC country configurations are regularly included in briefings to the Security Council. Council members should, in our view, also consider inviting the PBC country configuration Chairs, as appropriate, to closed consultations of the Security Council. Furthermore, we should work on expanding existing informal ways of interaction between the PBC and the Security Council outside the Consultations Room. In that connection, we have had fruitful informal exchanges of views on both Burundi and Liberia. We think it could be beneficial to the work of the Council to have more of those informal exchanges of views.

The PBC's Organizational Committee can do better in using the advantages of its unique intergovernmental

structure. It could potentially serve as an ideal platform to create stronger links between developments that take place outside the United Nations, such as activities of the World Bank, but also such initiatives as the New Deal for International Engagement in Fragile and the peacebuilding agenda of the United Nations. Equally, the PBC could help to link certain processes within the United Nations, such as the post-2015 development agenda, to the peacebuilding agenda.

Having myself served as Chair of the PBC's Organizational Committee, in 2010, I am very well aware of the opportunities, the challenges and the limitations of that unique intergovernmental body. All of us created it together in order to achieve more durable peace and development in countries emerging from conflict. It is therefore also our common responsibility to make it work.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Brazil.

Mrs. Viotti (Brazil) (*spoke in Spanish*): We are pleased to see you, Madam President, presiding over this meeting. Your presence with us today is an illustration both of the importance of the peacebuilding theme and of that which Colombia and all of us attach to building solid and lasting foundations for peace and security through socio-economic development.

(*spoke in English*)

I thank the Secretary-General for his briefing and for the work he has done in fostering peacebuilding as an essential component of the United Nations work. I also thank Ambassadors Gasana and Momem for their statements on the past and current work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). I also welcome the presence with us today of the Vice-President from the World Bank.

Allow me to touch upon three issues that should continue to merit our attention in the near future, namely, the relationship between the PBC and other United Nations bodies; the partnership with external actors; and resource mobilization.

As many previous speakers have said, enhancing the PBC's institutional linkages with the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council has been one of the most important undertakings of the Commission. That is a natural consequence of the diversity of challenges that it has to address and of the need to muster political support from the wider membership. We are convinced, in particular, that the PBC is in a unique position to perform its advisory role to the Security Council, especially with regard to countries that are on the agenda of both bodies. As the Council has already recognized, security and development are closely interlinked. The PBC is naturally suited to offer a comprehensive perspective on the root causes of conflict and on the multiple challenges in post-conflict scenarios. An integrated approach that takes into account the close interrelation between security and development as pillars of sustainable peace should be seen as an important added value of the PBC.

A coherent mix of peacebuilding and peacekeeping activities is also a powerful tool to ensure that short-term stabilization will be matched by a greater capacity to deal with medium- and long-term challenges to security. The better a State is equipped to address social and economic strife, the more it will be able to avoid a relapse into conflict. In that regard, the perspectives of the PBC can be valuable in a variety of areas, such as in security sector reform; disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes; the economic inclusion of women; youth employment; the management of natural resources; and the restoration of basic services and economic revitalization. We therefore hope that the synergy between the Security Council and the PBC will be continually strengthened, including through more frequent interactive dialogues and the participation of PBC Chairs in discussions that are of interest to both bodies.

Furthering a stronger relationship with regional organizations and United Nations missions is of the utmost importance to ensuring a more in-depth perspective on the reality on the ground and closer involvement with local stakeholders. The annual report (S/2012/70) demonstrates that the pool of PBC partners has been expanded lately. It is up to us to maintain the momentum. The case of international financial institutions should be singled out. The World Bank, the African Development Bank and the International Monetary Fund have been pivotal in helping post-conflict countries to improve economic management, jump-start economic recovery and access much-needed financial support.

That brings me to my last point, namely, the mobilization of resources. As we are all aware, the countries on the PBC's agenda usually have to overcome situations that generate a perception of high risk on the

part of donors, investors and international institutions. It is our role is to help them find ways of increasing the level of attention from the international community and garner the necessary resources to develop national capacities and to maintain stability.

We hope that today's discussions will be a further step in enhancing the relationship between the PBC and the Security Council. We also expect that it will help the Commission to play an even more meaningful role in the United Nations system.

As Chair of the Guinea-Bissau country-specific configuration, as well as a member of the Organizational Committee, Brazil reiterates its commitment to our common efforts to assisting countries emerging from conflict to achieve peace, stability and socioeconomic development.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There are still a number of speakers remaining on my list. Given the lateness of the hour, I intend, with the consent of the Council, to suspend the meeting until 3 o'clock.

The meeting was suspended at 1.05 p.m.